

### REMARKS

The Office Action of February 14, 2003 was received and carefully reviewed. Reconsideration and allowance of this case is respectfully requested for the reasons advanced in detail below.

Applicants also file simultaneously herewith a Petition for a Two Month Extension of Time which extends the time period of response until July 14, 2003. Consequently, the instant response should be considered timely filed.

Claims 1-26 were pending in the instant application. By this amendment, claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, and 19 are amended. As a result, claims 1-26 remain pending.

In the Office Action of February 14, 2003, the rejections of the claims are still unclear, as provided in the Request for Reconsideration filed on December 5, 2002. Specifically, it does not appear that claims 13-16 and 21-24 are rejected, since they are not provided in any of the rejections. Instead, claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hidemi et al., claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Hidemi Japanese Abstract Publication JP 03-159119, in view of Nakazawa, and claims 17, 18, 19, 20, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Hidemi et al. in view of Czubytyj et al. It is noted that claims 13-16 and 21 are discussed in the Section 102(e) rejection on pages 4-5 and claim 11, 12 and 24 are discussed in the Section 103(a) rejection including Nakazawa. To the extent these rejections are understood, these rejections are traversed for the reasons advanced in detail below.


Applicants hereby amend claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 17 to further clarify the present invention. Specifically, the independent claims are amended to recite that the moving of the glass substrate in a direction perpendicular to the elongation direction of the pulsed laser beams occurs during the directing of the laser beam to the glass substrate. These amendments are made in response to the Examiner's comments on page 2 of the Office Action, namely, that "it appears that removal of the glass substrate from the chamber 110 will occur in the direction perpendicular to the elongation direction." The claims of the instant application make it clear that the moving of the glass substrate is performed while the laser

beam is being directed to the glass substrate. The Examiner appears to be contending on page 2 of the Office Action that Hidemi et al. fails to teach this feature of the present invention, since the reliance on this reference provided by the Examiner relates to the removal of the substrate from the chamber.

In view thereof, Hidemi et al. fails to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention and, thus, the rejection of claims 1-12 under Section 102(e) should be overcome. Further, the secondary references relied upon by the Examiner in the Section 103 rejections fail to overcome this deficiency in Hidemi et al., and, thus, the rejections of the remaining claims should likewise be overcome.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn, that claims 1-26 be allowed, and that the application be passed to issue. If a conference would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey L. Costellia  
Registration No. 35,483

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 800  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 770-9300